Embracing Multidisciplinary Engagement: How Campus Museums in the U.S. Can Bolster Their Relevancy in an Increasingly Competitive Academic Funding Climate

AN ACADEMIC CAPSTONE PAPER SUBMITTED TO

THE COLLEGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY

Kayla Martin

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Professional Studies:
Arts and Cultural Leadership
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
Advisor: Tom Borrup, Ph.D., Director of Graduate Studies

May 2017

Abstract

There is a growing trend in universities and colleges in the U.S. putting an increasingly greater emphasis on science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) subjects and less on those part of the arts and humanities. This is largely due to the skewed notion that the fields involving science and technology fit best with the core academic mission and are the most valuable for students to immerse themselves in. STEM departments are therefore receiving a significant portion of institutional funding in comparison to arts-related areas, including campus art museums. However, the benefits of having the arts included in the academic career of all students, regardless of their field(s) of study, are becoming abundantly clear. Academic museums often act as that connecting factor between art and students of non-art related fields who may not realize how art can relate to their studies and be of value to them academically, professionally, and/or personally. Academic art museums must therefore promote themselves as a valuable resource for students of all disciplines in order for their parent institutions to recognize their importance in academia and more highly prioritize them, most significantly in the form of funding. This paper surveys and analyzes various strategies being developed and implemented at campus art museums across the country as a means to achieve this multi-disciplinary relevancy.

Keywords: academic museums, campus museums, relevancy, engagement, administrations, funding, arts and humanities, STEM

Introduction

Art museums at colleges and universities in the U.S. are unique in their ability to change the climate of the cultural and social landscape when given opportunity to be leaders in the museum field "by embracing the intellectual progress embodied in multidisciplinary studies" (Kim, 2007, p. 45). In doing so, they prove to be an "indispensable academic resource no less important for certain areas of study than libraries" (p. 45). Demonstrating the value of and renewing investment in these museums once established, however, has become difficult, as the economic situation in which they find themselves today stands to be their greatest challenge (Glesne, 2012c). How can academic art museums in the U.S. remain a relevant and valuable educational resource within their parent institutions amidst a de-prioritization of the arts and subsequent vulnerable funding climate? This paper will outline some of the research that has been done concerning this topic and highlight specific cases revealing effective strategies that have been implemented by various campus art museums to validate their role as valuable, multidisciplinary resources and thereby providing applicable blueprints from which other institutions can replicate and expand.

Over the past decade, leaders of and donors to higher education institutions have come to the same conclusion that "investment in the arts is essential to building a competitive institution in an increasingly global world" (Sheets, 2017, para 1). Nevertheless, as many large universities are faced with increasingly limited budgets and expenditures, cuts are being made to those resources seen as having diminished academic relevancy. Where this erosion of funding is occurring, the humanities are being pared (Lewin, 2013). Academic art museums continue to fall into this category, many facing institutional funding cuts year after year, despite the significant usage of the collections of these museums in the academic work of students across a wide variety

of disciplines. It has been made apparent that "academically affiliated art museums need to continually demonstrate their academic value to their host college or university" (Coleman, 1942, p. 2). This is primarily a means to ensure that each museum fits within the context and mission of its parent institution in order to be considered financially viable and worth maintaining.

There is a growing trend in universities and colleges devoting a greater amount of funding and attention toward science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) subjects and providing less of both to those of the arts and humanities (Lewin, 2013). Funding for humanities research in the U.S. has decreased since 2009 at a steady pace, and in 2011 it was less than half of one percent of the total allocated to development in the science and engineering fields (Delany, 2013). This is largely due to the increasingly popular political notion stipulating that the fields involving science and technology fit best with the core academic mission of higher education institutions, and having students pursue them in their collegiate studies is both important for stimulating the economy and valuable for graduates in regards to finding employment in their field (Cohen, 2016). According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, at least 15 states "offer some type of bonus or premium for certain high-demand degrees" (para. 3).

STEM departments are therefore receiving a significantly larger portion of institutional funding in comparison to arts-related areas, including campus museums, which are "scrambling to figure out how to depend less on institutional dollars" (Glesne, 2012c, p. 21) because when school budgets are limited, these museums, like other units that fall within the humanities, feel the pressure. However, the benefits of having the arts included in the academic career of any student, regardless of their field of study, are becoming clear, as illustrated by the fact that since

2000 college and university administrations have been progressively strengthening their arts programs (Bradley, 2009). Many schools of higher education are "seeking to cultivate the creativity that the future requires, beefing up arts programs, and pointing to campus art museums as vital resources in developing the *creative campus*" (p. 2). These museums often act as the connecting factor between art and students of non-art related fields who may not realize how art can relate to their discipline and be of value to them academically, professionally, and/or personally in a manner that can teach them the ways of knowing and seeing that can be gained from interacting with the arts and also indicate "the extraordinarily wide impact that this kind of knowing can have on many aspects of life and learning" (Matthias, 1987, p. 95).

Academic museums must promote themselves as a valuable resource for all disciplines in order for their parent institutions to recognize the importance they hold in academia and realize that individuals pursuing any field of study may stand to "gain education, even in professional attainment, by a museum which can impart some understanding of the nature of human cultural, social, and organic life" (Mandelbaum, 1953, p. 757). Amidst institutional challenges involving funding and prioritization, it can be reasoned that pursuing the following practices, garnered from the literature and research cited within this paper, can bolster the relevancy of campus art museums to their academic audiences: maintaining an interdisciplinary focus by means of aligning museum programs with teaching and research agendas; involving students and faculty in the development of exhibitions and programming; planning events and programs that appeal to a diverse array of students and faculty of various departments; and creating an academic coordinator position to act as a liaison between students, faculty, and the museum via effective outreach methods and development of curriculum-related programs.

Literature Review

Academic museums were largely established over the course of the 19th century in the United States as higher education institutions diversified, forging new disciplines and areas of research that demanded various types of collections (Thomas, 2016). Laurence Vail Coleman, president of the American Alliance of Museums from 1927-1958 and author of many museum-related works, is known for his strong belief that the principle commitment of campus museums should be to their academic audiences in fostering curricular connections. In 1942 he stated,

> The campus museum should be, above all, an instrument of teaching or research, or of both…the first duty of a university or college museum is to its parent establishment, which means that the faculty and student body have a claim prior to that of townspeople and outsiders in general (p. 5-6).

According to Laurel Bradley (2009), Director of Exhibitions and Curator of the College Art Collection at Carleton College, academic museums largely fulfilled this commitment up until 1942 when they began functioning more like independent museums serving the outside community rather than the campus community and, as such, received a sizable amount of community support and funds. It was common for students to seldom visit unless required by a studio art or art history class assignment. According to Corrine Glesne of the Kress Foundation (2012b), commitment on behalf of universities and colleges to arts education started to become more apparent as an increasing number of academic museums with an arts focus started to become established in the 1950s. She goes on to describe the 1960s during which these museums became significantly more community-focused, employed professional standards and practices, and "sought to separate themselves from departmental politics, becoming somewhat autonomous units on campus" (p. 4).

Due in part to cuts in funding, the 21st century is seeing a shift back to the view held by Coleman regarding how academic art museums should be – focused on the education of students, faculty, and researchers on campus - thus demonstrating parent institutions and their academic museums engaging in *dynamic rapprochement* back to the initial principles outlined by Coleman (Bradley, 2009). However, this time the campus museum became an "active site for teaching and learning for students and faculty not only in the disciplines of studio art and art history but all across the curriculum" (p. 2). Glesne (2012b) makes the assertion that as academic museums have once again transitioned to become sites of teaching, learning, and research on campuses, their focus is less on art departments alone and more on being an integral part of a variety of curricula.

A report from the Cultural Policy Center at the University of Chicago on the topic of campus art museums in the 21st century was generated from research involving a selected group of eight campus art museum directors and five outside experts in the museum field to describe how they think the field is evolving, what changes are currently being made, and what opportunities and roles are emerging (Shapiro, Linett, & Anderson, 2012). Diversity in geography, perspective, and institutional type and size were all considered when assembling the participant group. The authors postulate that "a great deal of the conversation and innovation within the campus art museum community in recent years has focused on deepening connections with the host university" (p. 5), and these museums may now be at a "critical juncture in determining what roles they can and want to play" (p. 18). They go on to state that although off-campus communities should not be left out, students, researchers, faculty, and other university audiences are of greater priority – this includes the presidents, provosts, and trustees to whom directors of campus museums report. Henry Kim (2007), previous academic museum curator and

project director, adds to this notion in his claim that campus museums need to be museums that "challenge the conventional ways of displaying objects, invigorated by their participation in teaching and research" (p. 47), as opposed to focusing on catering to outside audiences (p. 47). This method of object-based inquiry emphasized by Kim is also reverberated in the Cultural Policy Center report as being a practice that matches well with new research being carried out on multiple learning styles (Shapiro, et al., 2012).

According to Glesne (2012a), the fact that art museums or exhibition galleries are now included in over 700 academic institutions throughout the U.S. demonstrates the positive effects academic museums have on the formal education of many. The Cultural Policy Center report adds that while they may be informal learning environments for some audience groups within various circumstances, they are "simultaneously, and primarily, part of a *formal* educational system" (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 12). Glesne (2012c) echoes this sentiment in her claim that, "Just as learning a different language expands students' understanding of the world, so too learning art as a new language can expand students' ways of expressing themselves and appreciating the self-expression of others" (p. 24). Additional educational benefits of academic museums she discusses include: integrating the arts and sciences as a means to foster essential creativity; providing an opportunity to *learn from the masters*; teaching a language of nonverbal communication; enhancing critical thinking skills through exploring particular subjects across time and cultures; maintaining a forum for addressing issues of diversity and discrimination; and helping to identify and rectify inequities in access of various communities to art.

Significant challenges are faced by academic museums in an effort to successfully sustain themselves within fluctuating campus climates that often lead them to becoming siloed from the parent institutions, "evolving into largely autonomous units on campus" (Goethals & Fabing,

2007, p. 12). Shapiro, Linett, Farrell, and Anderson (2012) describe in their work documenting participant observation that the challenges campus museums face today are unique, as they find themselves "embedded in a larger institutional structure that can be unwieldy and where the 'center of gravity' resides within academic departments and with tenured faculty" (p. 4-5). The authors go on to state how this creates difficulty for campus museums to pursue interdisciplinary work, as they are not an official part of the traditional academic departments, thus resulting in some of these museums struggling to be considered relevant to the central mission and identity of their parent institutions.

The disconnect between campus art museums and their parent institutions can lead to a skewed, poorly conceived view on behalf of university and college administrations regarding the value these museums hold as an academic resource, as described by an administrator of higher education in her statement that some museums are "coming under close scrutiny as part of resource and space reviews conducted by their universities" (Kelly, 2001, p. 7), so as research and teaching needs shift, it is likely a university museum will find its value as an educational resource within its parent institution weakened. As various types of changes take place, academic art museums must accommodate these changes as to remain relevant to current curricula and teaching methods. Because they are operating in an extremely complex and often-fluctuating environment, campus art museums remain "inevitably affected by the profound changes sweeping through higher education, including the advent of new modes of teaching and learning, the erosion of established disciplinary boundaries and questions about the value and cost of an undergraduate degree, especially in the liberal arts" (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 2).

If the role of an academic art museum is not seen as a fit within the context and mission of its parent institution, the museum is likely at risk for losing institutional funding and even

getting shut down altogether, as it is not seen as financially or academically viable (Matthias, 2009). Bradley (2009) illuminates this poor connection between the campus art museum and its parent institution using the Rose Art Museum at Brandeis University as cautionary example. President Jehuda Reinharz announced he was going to close the museum and liquidate the art collection in 2009, claiming to do so in order to better serve the educational mission of the university, as it was believed that the museum was not a crucial university resource, was focused more heavily on its public rather than academic audiences, and had a history acting as an autonomous entity not closely connected with the university. Jaschik (2009) also features this example in his work for *Inside Higher Ed*, explaining that Reinharz had proposed the idea as a means to raise money for the wider university during times of economic strain, and in doing so, completely disregarding the value its collections hold educationally for a diverse array of the student population. Due to significant public outcry, Reinharz reversed his plan, but according to Bradley (2009) in reference to the future, "The perception of the Rose as a community museum on a university campus rather than a college-wide resource for teaching and learning, may ultimately prove fatal to this distinguished campus museum" (p. 7).

A crucial first step to be taken by the administration of a campus art museum in becoming aligned with the core campus direction and mission, as well as being understood by faculty and administration as being aligned with these, is to answer the fundamental questions of "Why does this institution have an art museum?" and "What is our campus art museum expected to contribute to the campus mission and 'brand'?" (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 5). Most commonly these answers will highlight the importance of the unique type of object-based teaching and learning the academic museum can provide, as it is thought that it is important for academic museums to provide active learning environments and encourage active learning methods

because “sophisticated forms of thinking and learning that lead to complex aesthetic understandings result from direct interaction with objects” (Bradley, 2009, p. 5). Kim (2007) supplements this in his claim that campus museums are rare resources, as not all colleges and universities have study collections that allow students and researchers to observe and handle firsthand original objects and art. Sustaining relevancy by utilizing this type of education must be applied across disciplines, as students of higher education today represent greater cultural diversity than at any other time in history, and campus art museums have the great potential to “bring tools of visual investigation, knowledge curation, and cultural analysis to bear on a wide variety of domains” (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 9).

Maintaining financially stability and acquiring adequate funding remains one of the most significant challenges academic art museums face, as the idea that they are expendable commodities on university and college campuses “remains alive in our collective system” (Cotter, 2009, para. 22). Glesne (2012c) attributes these fiscal difficulties largely to the widespread affects felt by universities and colleges of general economic downturn, resulting in specific difficulties for the academic art museums of affected institutions, including deferred physical maintenance, staff attrition, lack of replacement staff, inability to attend conferences or pursue research opportunities, deferral of acquisition and conservation of objects, reduced ability to share art, and decreased ability to promote events. In response, the Association of Academic Museums and Galleries (AAMG) formed the Task Force for the Protection of University Collections in 2009 as a means to create and enforce standards for academic art museums, claiming that art collections of university and college museums are increasingly being regarded as disposable and coveted assets by their parent institutions that are “desperate to shore up faltering endowment funds or to fill budget gaps caused by reduced funding from states”

(AAMG, 2017, para. 2). The AAMG report goes on to make the following statement regarding the particular trouble academic art museums must deal with:

> All university museums may be vulnerable to closure to avoid the costs of maintaining them, but university art museums, with collections that have obvious commercial value in the marketplace, are particularly at risk as university administrators, who have little knowledge of the inner workings of the art market, make difficult decisions that they believe mean life or death for their institutions (para. 3).

Staff and leaders of university art museums often find themselves concerned that they are lower on the priority lists of their school administrations, specifically in regards to financial resources and attention (or lack thereof) of university management given to the museums, despite their success in creating "innovative ways of communicating with new audiences" and maintaining collections that exceed high standards in presentation and preservation" (OECD, 2001, p. 3).

It has been made the norm for non-instructional units at colleges and universities, such as the campus museum, to be "first on the chopping block during economic downturns" (Glesne, 2012c, p. 12). Since "most major change initiatives, from strategic planning and capital campaigns to the construction of new buildings and other infrastructure investments, are directed in top-down fashion by university leadership (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 14)," campus arts initiatives, such as the art museum, are put in direct competition with other academic areas that presidents, provosts, and trustees may perceive as being of higher priority and urgency, including primarily the STEM disciplines: science, technology, engineering, and math. Although these museums provide an effective platform for teaching and learning, they typically do not generate academic credits on their own without faculty involvement, so according to many college and university administrations, they are considered *non-revenue generating units*, which then puts them further down on the priority list for funding, the lack thereof leading to an inadequate number of staff putting in lots of extra hours (Glesne, 2012c). Thus a significant challenge

academic art museums continue to face is finding creative ways of "making or keeping a place for themselves, and for the visual arts, at the heart of the university's priorities and mission" (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 14). Figuring out how to do so amongst expanding academic opportunities, a growing focus on the STEM fields, and increasing competition for funding continues to be a crucial mission for the arts and humanities at large, with campus art museums at the forefront, finding their own approaches to ensuring they are seen as an academic asset for which expending institutional resources is worthy.

Academic art museums must rely on non-institutional funding to a significant degree as well. Appropriations from the parent institution of a museum tend to make up forty to sixty percent of its budget, leaving the museum accountable for the rest, which typically comes from a combination of earned income and endowments (Glesne, 2012c). According to research on 35 different university art museums by Lyndel King, Director of the University of Minnesota Weisman Museum of Art, not a single one is 100% funded by its parent institution, and on average the universities provide only 41% of annual expenses, whilst the lowest was found to be 5%. She goes into further detail than Glesne in specifying other sources of non-institutional support in the form of memberships, private foundation gifts, individual gifts, earned income, endowment or invested funds held in trust for the museum, and federal or state government grants, all of which are becoming increasingly necessary to acquire because "at the same time as funding sources have changed, exhibitions and museum operations generally have gotten more expensive (p. 23-25)" as competition with other cultural activities is concurrently growing.

The 2007 report completed on the College and University Art Museum Program (CUAM) initiated by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation concluded that, in regards to fundraising and the economic climate for academic art museums, institutional and donor support

is more likely for those with an academic focus, thereby making students and faculty the priority audience group (Goethals & Fabing, 2007). The report goes on to claim that if a museum determines that students and faculty should, indeed, be its main focus, a grant such as that given by the Mellon Foundation is not absolutely necessary for improvements to be made, as it can choose to allocate its available resources accordingly and consider reducing costs within other areas in order to ensure more is not promised than can be delivered. Cotter (2009) offers a hopeful view concerning the increasing value academic art museums hold on a broader scale and the consequent greater pool of available funding opportunities available to them in his assertion that,

> In a bleak economy, when our big public museums threaten to sink under budget-busting excesses, the university museum offers a model for small, intensely researched, collection-based, convention-challenging exhibitions that could get museums through a bumpy present and carry them, lighter and brighter, into the future (para. 23).

This implies the notion of campus art museums gaining relevancy and value in the eyes of not only those utilizing them but also of potential funders, as "schools that had not previously cultivated arts giving have found new donors stepping up" (Sheets, 2017, para. 7). Campus art museums are thus in an apt position to lead, influence, and experiment, due in part to university alumni and national funders becoming "strong proponents of interdisciplinary approaches and innovative collaborations (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 15)," thereby placing the museums at an advantage for receiving funding from these sources.

One of the most innovative and successful types of campus art museums today has proven in various capacities to be the teaching museum, the purpose of which is to teach art by various means, including generating exhibitions, training student docents, hosting traveling exhibits and, of utmost importance, supporting a broad array of disciplines studied and

researched on campus (Douglass, 2012). Bradley (2009) points to one of the positive outcomes resulting from campus art museums functioning as and committing themselves to the principles of a teaching museum, claiming that "aligning museum programs with the teaching and research agendas of the college or university may yield increased internal funding in today's climate" (p. 6). She suggests that their value as an academic asset is heightened by doing so, thereby increasing their chance to be allotted greater institutional support amongst increasing competition for resources. In addition to the potential financial advantage, Douglass (2012) describes the constructive outcomes that the efforts of teaching museums can have on students in their capacity to make art more relevant and less exclusive, as well as "give students a sense of scale and hands-on learning" (2012, para. 7).

Some of the prominent academic art museums that have successfully adopted the teaching museum model and will be discussed further in the paper include the Frances Young Tang Teaching Museum and Art Gallery at Skidmore College in New York, the Hood Museum of Art at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire, Bowdoin College Museum of Art in Maine, Middlebury Museum of Art in Vermont, and Williams College Museum of Art in Massachusetts. The findings that follow identify how the principles by which teaching museums are grounded and the methods they have developed in connecting with the academic audiences of their respective parent institutions provide not only a template for other campus museums to utilize but also convey to donors the increasing relevance of these museums in higher education today and the substantial value in supporting their current and future initiatives.

Methodology

The view of the researcher, who has been part of multiple higher education communities and is actively engaged in nonprofit arts organizations, including museums, has provided a base of experiences and observations off of which to pursue the research discussed within this paper. The positionality of the researcher adds the perspective of an individual who has apt knowledge of current practices in the field but is less familiar with past practices and the transitions between the two due to being in the early part of their career.

The selection of cases used was based off their relatability to one another and the similar patterns of strategies found among them. As a means to remain consistent, the research concentrated on universities and colleges of small to medium in size that have a single academic art museum that is either labeled a teaching museum or is adapting teaching museum methods. Core features of the Qualitative Case Study Methodology were used, most prominently of which is the usage of multiple case studies, which "enables the researcher to explore differences within and between cases" (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 548) and identify similar findings across the cases. This paper outlines the repeated findings of the researcher in regards to the implementation of strategies by academic museums in the U.S. to increase their relevancy across disciplines as a means to be acknowledged by their parent institutions as valuable cross-campus resources and be in better positions to obtain increased funding.

The process of analyzing the data from the various chosen sources and formulating conclusions involved processes of *triangulation*, which uses "multiple perceptions to clarify meaning, verifying the repeatability of an observation or interpretation" and also serves to "clarify meaning by identifying different ways the phenomenon is being seen" (Stake, 2003, p. 148). The combination of these practices, along with the particular perspectives from which the

researcher gathered and interpreted the data, resulted in the findings and recommendations found within this paper.

Findings

Interdisciplinary Focus

It can be surmised that in order for academic art museums to be regarded as a valuable institutional resource for a broad array of disciplines, there must be interaction between the campus museum and the faculty and students of various departments outside of the arts and humanities, forging a connection in some way that is relevant and beneficial to their educational pursuits. Developing interdisciplinary connections has become increasingly prevalent, as universities and colleges "now think of the arts less as a peripheral extracurricular activity than as an opportunity for innovative collaboration" (Sheets, 2017, para. 6). Campus administrators are seeing the art museum as a research or teaching laboratory, comparable to those in the field of science, and as such, "faculty across disciplines explore ways to expand the scope of their courses and teaching methods through use of the art museum" (Glesne, 2012c, p. 6).

The most valuable way in which students may become familiar with and effectively utilize the art museum on their campuses comes in the form of forging of partnerships between faculty and the museum curator and staff, which has become more common in museums of higher education today (Bradley, 2009). Through these partnerships, connections between various curriculums and the museum content are made, thus allowing for faculty to integrate the art museum into their courses in innovative ways that add new perspectives to content that may enhance the educational gains of students in those particular subjects. When the museums reach out to departments that would not be automatically be associated with their offerings, such as

those of the science and medicine fields, and assist them in using the resources provided by the museums in their instructional and research programs, they are "taking an interdisciplinary, humanistic approach" that can combine the "visual, literary, and performing arts in ways that could link up with course offerings in many departments" (Zeller, 1985, p. 93).

The Tang Teaching Museum and Art Gallery at Skidmore College in New York stands as a pioneer in developing and using the practices and principles inherent in the teaching museum model. This is most prominently visible in its programming that is tailored "to foster formative connections between contemporary art and students of all ages," ("About the Tang Museum," 2017, para. 1) in addition to its intent to make its exhibitions and usage of the museum by students and faculty "a significant aspect of the interdisciplinary undergraduate liberal arts education it offers," wherein art can be used to advance the learning and knowledge of students across disciplines (para. 4). The Tang as a curriculum-focused, interdisciplinary campus art museum represents "a major milestone along the road to reconciling the college museum with the college curriculum," (Bradley, 2009, p. 3) fostering connections to various curricula from the arts and humanities to the sciences and beyond. The Tang staff collaborate with faculty to create exhibitions that contain both artworks and non-art objects that relate to various curricula topics being focused on by students. The art pieces remain the main focus, but they are supplemented by and present in dialogue with telling objects from other fields, such as maps, biological models, and meteorites, effecting what Bradley calls the *new exhibition paradigm*, the key challenge of which lies in generating an experience that is both an intellectual and aesthetic one.

Faculty involvement with the museum "serves the college's eventual goal of making museum exhibitions as integral to college learning as the library, the science laboratory and the studio" (Bradley, 2009, p. 4), which is done predominantly by incorporating content that crosses

time periods and subjects, encompasses a wide range of media and objects, and explores intersections between otherwise largely unrelated disciplines in innovative ways ("About the Tang Museum," 2017). This practice has piqued the interest of various departments at Skidmore and resulted in the Tang becoming a highly relevant campus resource, thus presenting a method by which other campus museums may adapt to fit their institutional needs and capacities.

As a means to gain and maintain campus-wide relevancy, it is critical for academic art museums to place a high priority on providing access to collections for teaching, and it can be especially valuable to ensure that the museum curators are invested in and able to teach, on a minimal extent, as part of their normal position obligations (Kim, 2007). A 2012 report by Corrine Glesne to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation outlines a qualitative study involving several academic art museums and focuses on the academic involvement, "on the acts of experiencing and learning, thinking and creativity" (p. 4), enabled by these museums as valuable campus resources. A section of this report is dedicated to identifying six core learning objectives that each academic museum should be working to fulfill. The first is skill development, including visual literacy skills and pedagogical skills, an example of which is described using the case of a professor of art education grouping her students with docents at the campus museum to learn about working with children in the museum, thus calling it the *Second Grade Tour*. Classes of other departments that are non-arts related have used campus museums in innovative ways as well, including pharmacology students using a collection of photos of HIV patients as a means to practice medical observation skills; an algebra class visiting a Frank Lloyd Write house affiliated with the campus museum to work out various aspects of the house construction and design to complete an assignment; and music classes linking the compositions they are playing and

studying to their historical roots in different art forms as a way to gain new perspectives on and deeper knowledge of their focus areas.

The second learning objective, interdisciplinary analysis, focuses on the ways in which "interdisciplinary use of the museum – crossing disciplinary boundaries and connecting diverse schools of thought – contributes to new understandings" (Glesne, 2012b, p. 13), thus providing a platform for creative interpretation and fostering engagement with those whose background is not in the arts or humanities by showing correlations between their studies and the art they see in the galleries. Social critique is identified as the third objective, referring to the campus art museum utilizing its resources to set an appropriate, comfortable platform to engage students in identifying and discussing important societal topics, as it has been seen that exhibitions exploring social issues generate greater interest on campus and provide what Glesne refers to as a *safe space* for these conversations. Research is fourth objective, due to the vast opportunities art objects and themes provide as subjects of critical inquiry, especially for graduate students and faculty pursuing advanced research, an example of which involves a pharmacology professor using her experience in the campus art museum with her students for her research, resulting in a publication on teaching pharmacology through art.

The fifth learning objective, creative inspiration, may be the most common and sought after in the experiences of students at the campus art museum because it has been observed that "whether visual, musical, or verbal, professors use the art museum to inspire in their students creative acts and new art" (Glesne, 2012b, p. 18). An easily replicable practice used to spark creativity includes hosting essay contests wherein awards and/or small prizes are given by museum staff to students of any discipline that submit a piece of creative writing about one of the objects in the museum, perhaps also fulfilling a writing requirement for another class if

coordinated with the course faculty. This example demonstrates the value in collaborations among staff of the museums and other institutional units, most prominently faculty of various departments. When both parties are proactive in fostering an effective partnership, museum staff can suggest to faculty ways in which the content and/or resources of the museum can augment their courses; respond to requests for pulling particular artwork for individual class sessions; and co-teach or team-teach with a professor either for a class session or for the full duration of a course, working together to prepare and present the relevant material.

Museum staff and faculty working together creates opportunities for classes to exercise skills in comparative analysis, which is the sixth and last learning objective outlined in the report. This collective effort in correlating course topics to museum content in ways that are valuable to the students and their learning is being effectuated in new, innovative ways. One example involves a university music professor who has made it routine to incorporate museum visits into his curriculum after seeing the positive effects they have had in student comprehension of particular topics. He states that the museum has become a great pedagogical tool, and during his class visits he has repeatedly noticed that students who don't typically talk have begun opening up in new ways, which helps in getting them "out of their comfort zone of sitting behind a desk" (Glesne, 2012b, p. 14). Another professor who teaches biology takes his classes to the campus art museum to comparatively analyze expressions of love across cultures, focusing on the ways in which the representation of love has evolved over the years, how it differs between the East and West, and whether the depictions of it in art are true in comparison to what scientists would say should be happening in the body. It can thus be shown that the academic art museum "lends itself well to comparing concepts over time and/or across cultures" (p. 15) and in

doing so provides deeper insight and a more comprehensive understanding of particular subjects than the typical learning methods utilized inside the classroom.

One of the most influential projects involved in the effort to align the programs of academic art museums with teaching and research agendas is the College and University Art Program (CUAM) developed by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation beginning in the 1990s that "catalyzed campus museums' reorientation back to the curriculum" as well as "stimulated fruitful experiments that now serve as blueprints for action to others in the field (Bradley, 2009, p. 2). The program was developed out of the increasing separation of many campus museums from their parent institutions into two separate units, thus creating a void of collaboration between the two, and due to the highly restricted budgets of these museums, funds for activities to strengthen their pedagogical programs were limited (Goethals & Fabing, 2007). The CUAM program was initiated by the Foundation to help remedy this disconnect with two identifiable goals in mind: "To discover and institutionalize effective ways that would enable museums and academic partners to collaborate fruitfully; and to strengthen the educational role of the museum and its collections in the teaching and training of undergraduates and graduate students" (p. 1). The program initially provided grants to 18 institutions dispersed over three years, which led to an additional two years and eventually an established permanent endowment. It was acknowledged by the program that since circumstances on each campus varied and warranted different approaches, it could not be dictated by the program exactly how the funds would be employed, so the aims were outlined in a more general sense and emphasized most significantly the development of long-term relationships between the campus museums and faculty that encouraged involvement from a wide range of disciplines extending beyond the arts and humanities.

The program saw exceptionally positive results in helping guide the recipient museums toward increased engagement and integration with the educational factions of their respective parent institutions and thus increase the use of museum resources by faculty and students for scholarly purposes, often enhancing the topics being covered in courses spanning a wide range of departments (Goethals & Fabing, 2007). As curricular goals began to align with those of the involved campus museums in regards to capabilities, processes, and desired outcomes, interdisciplinary collaboration was able to expand, thus leading campus administrations to acknowledge the value inherent in the museums in relation to their curricula connections subsequently committing increased levels of resources to continue these efforts. By bolstering an interdisciplinary focus, faculty at the schools involved with the CUAM Program came to acknowledge the educational benefits of taking students out of the typical learning venues (i.e. classrooms, lecture halls, libraries) when integrating principles of art into their course material and, rather, in front of actual artwork, allowing students to view certain topics in new ways and discover interest in a field with which many were previously unfamiliar. These museums that implemented successful academic programs by means collaborating with faculty and students became "recognized as venues where interdisciplinary activities could flourish (p. 10)," including study groups, symposia, joint publications, and performances, all of which "reverberated positively" across the campuses.

The critical long-term outcome cited by multiple faculty was the way(s) in which their experience in working with the campus museum had changed their teaching for the better, generating a permanent shift in attention to their teaching methods and the curriculum they choose to use, as well as encouraging them to recruit other faculty in utilizing the campus museum as an effective teaching resource (Goethals & Fabing, 2007). The CUAM Program

helped popularize the idea that academic museums should support faculty in the development of courses that incorporate the use of their resources, including the study of original artworks in its collection, as well as the importance of continuity, postulating that "the more structures for intellectual exchange between faculty and museum staff exist, the better attuned the latter will be to developing currents in academic inquiry and the more effective will be their contribution" (p. 19-20). The precedent set by the program in its methods of interdisciplinary work continues over a decade later as an effective blueprint for implementing successful museum-institution partnerships that show to be educationally valuable across a wide spectrum of disciplines.

Various approaches to developing and maintaining an interdisciplinary focus have been designed and tested by different academic museums following the teaching museum model, often involving relatively simple, inexpensive methods that can be easily adapted to different settings and yield equally positive outcomes. One of these is the designation of a particular space for creativity and dialogue surrounding the artwork, as developed at Williams College Museum of Art in Massachusetts with the Rose Object Classroom. This special teaching space provides an intimate atmosphere for the close study and discussion of particular pieces of art that are selected by faculty with the help of the museum staff depending on the course and specific topic being taught. The type of hands-on learning provided in a designated space such as the Rose Object Classroom is ideal for faculty and students coming from various disciplines to make connections with the art in relation to their curricula with the help of museum staff providing support for the class sessions taking place within the space ("Rose Object Classroom," 2017). Another method is the curriculum-structured tour that is created specifically for the particular needs of a class interested in using the artwork of the museum to enhance course content and involves faculty and museum staff meeting to plan and prepare material in a collaborative effort (Matthias, 1987).

As a prominent teaching museum, the Hood Museum at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire is noted amongst college and university museums for the great extent to which its collections and exhibitions are integrated into faculty curricula ("An Extraordinary Teaching Collection," 2016). The museum is also credited for creating an innovative educational program renowned for its *Learning to Look* method. As described by the museum, "This five-step approach to exploring works of art—careful observation, analysis, research, interpretation, and finally critical assessment and response—is designed to empower visitors to observe carefully and think critically about works of art they encounter" ("Learn at the Hood," 2016, para. 2). A key example of non-art disciplines using the museum to supplement their studies includes a workshop developed by faculty in coordination with museum staff titled "The Art of Clinical Observation" wherein medical students use the *Learning to Look* method to enhance their diagnostic skills when doing work with patients, as well as students of a writing program utilizing the technique to learn how to "read" works of art in a similar manner as they have learned to decipher literary works. These methods with heir proven successes, in conjunction with their applicability across other academic art museum settings, emphasize the importance of interdisciplinary efforts. They are also clear indicators that these museums are being re-defined within the context of their parent institutions as active sites "for teaching and learning for students and faculty not only in the disciplines of studio art and art history, but all across the curriculum" (Bradley, 2009, p. 2).

Student and Faculty Involvement

Another critical piece in the effort to increase the relevance of academic museums across disciplines entails involving students and faculty in the development of exhibits and programming, because "multiple voices – of students, faculty, artists, outside researchers – are a

refreshing alternative to the anonymous, omniscient institutional narrator one usually encounters in public museum didactic materials" (Bradley, 2007, p. 7). This method is integral to the large volume of student and faculty contribution in the running of the Tang Teaching Museum and Art Gallery at Skidmore College, as its role as a teaching museum has necessitated maintaining this objective as an active priority, exemplified by John Weber, former Director of the Tang, in his statement:

> Being something more than an art museum enables you to work effectively with campus constituencies – faculty in particular – for whom art is an afterthought, a diversion, or an intimidating challenge. In many cases, art simply does not fit in the syllabus (2012, para. 3).

The Tang has developed an innovative exhibition program that regularly involves students and faculty as curators and advisors for its renowned exhibitions showcasing interdisciplinary content in a variety of ways, many of which include material related to other non-art courses and "combine diverse objects such as antique maps, scientific equipment, Rube Goldberg cartoons, Hudson River School landscapes, and Shaker furniture with new works of international contemporary art" ("About the Tang Museum," 2017, para. 5). Faculty have shown eagerness in creating proposals for shows about topics not directly related to the arts, such as geography and chemistry, and the success of this program, calculated by growing rates of interest and participation, reveal that art is fundamentally integrative and multidisciplinary in its foundation (Weber, 2012).

In their joint work on 21st century campus art museums, Shapiro, Linett, Farrell, and Anderson (2012) discovered the high level of importance of outreach to faculty by examining the various initiatives that have been taken in recent years to bring faculty members from various disciplines, such as the natural and physical sciences, into co-curatorial roles within the museum, which has helped to "increase pedagogic relevance to a broader array of academic disciplines"

(p. 10). As the idea of the museum as a classroom becomes increasingly normalized, faculty become progressively comfortable with the idea of participating in the development of exhibition projects that will then be the focus of their courses, which is a common practice for faculty at Williams College with its campus art museum ("Cocurate," n.d.). The Smart Museum at the University of Chicago has also made clear their commitment to making research and interests of faculty a key element in the special exhibitions they develop as well as reaching out to faculty to get them involved in "all aspects of creating an exhibition from planning through execution of a show" (Glesne, 2012b, p. 24). Other university and college art museums are purposefully reaching out to faculty to join their committees as a means to keep more of their campus communities informed about the current happenings of and challenges facing the museums, whilst concurrently expanding their support bases via communications to students and other staff from the participating faculty members (p. 9).

The recipient academic art museums of the previously mentioned CUAM Program funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation emerged from the program emphasizing more deeply the importance of using exhibitions and their development as an "effective tool in creating links with the academic agenda" (Goethals & Fabing, 2007, p. 24), thus consistently connecting the museum collections to various curricula. The CUAM Program created almost 300 internships at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, the student participants of which reported sparked interest in, as well as respect and admiration for, the content found within the museums and the operations that keep them running efficiently. A consistent pattern found across the participating museums was the thriving nature of their interdisciplinary programs when developed collaboratively with faculty and students. These included symposia, joint

publications, study groups, and performances, all of which, according to Goethals and Fabing (2007), "reverberated across campus" at each school (p. 10).

Another report from Corrine Glesne (2012a) outlines the results from a study involving interviews and observations at seven colleges and universities that have been recognized as having exemplary art museums. A wide variety of individuals were interviewed, 129 in total, including students, faculty, museum directors and staff, campus administrators, and others who play important roles at the museums such as security staff and community volunteer. Students having the opportunity to be directly involved in and obtain a firsthand feel for the various operational and curatorial aspects of museum work was found to be a common thread amongst the museums studied, as noted by Glesne (2012a):

> Through hands-on learning, students become familiar with planning and preparing exhibition space, curating a show, writing labels, handling and storing art, record keeping, provenance research, leading tours and educating others about art, and security concerns; in other words, with the many tasks associated with running an art museum. The work often changes, giving students multiple museum experiences (p. 108).

It is important to note that many of these students were not in arts-related fields of study, yet thrived in the roles they were placed in and contributed new ideas from their outside studies to be incorporated into their work, exemplified by the case of three math students at the University of Arizona and the curator of the campus museum working together to produce an exhibition in 2012 focused on math and art titled *The Aesthetic Code: Unraveling the Secrets of Art*. The exhibition "explored mathematic and design principles that artists have used for centuries (Glesne, 2012a, p. 112)," and was developed by students and the curator sorting through works from the museum collection together and selecting art pieces that aptly demonstrated individual concepts, from lines to tessellations. The text that accompanied the pieces was formulated to clarify the concepts to those unfamiliar with math and/or art. Talks by math teachers and students

were held in the museum, which brought in students who had never visited the museum before and also encouraged other faculty to use the exhibition in their courses (2012a). The examples from these cases illustrate the positive impact that the involvement of students and faculty in the inner workings of the academic museum(s) on their campuses can have on audience diversification, thus bringing classes and individuals belonging to a range of both art- and non-art areas of study. With improved outreach to and subsequent increased involvement with various students and faculty who may not otherwise be typical visitors, a higher rate of relevancy can be reached, as emphasized by Glesne (2012c) in her characterization of the campus museum as a portal, and as such, states that it is "a gateway and a link among people, resources, and ideas" (p. 7).

Academic Coordinator Position

An additional innovation adopted by many academic museums in recent years as a means to maintain active visibility on campus and effective connections with staff and students of different departments is the position of an academic coordinator, which acts as the liaison between the campus community and the museum, functioning as a *human bridge* between separate divisions of a college or university (Bradley, 2009). Staff positions have been created to generate a new era of cooperation between the schools and their academic museum(s) in the form of various titles, including Coordinator of Academic Affairs, Curator of Academic Initiatives, Curator of Academic Programs (or Programming), Curatorial Liaison, and Coordinator of Academic Affairs. This designated individual is responsible for scheduling class visits, informing faculty about new acquisitions in the collection, current and upcoming exhibitions, and other events relevant to the work of both staff and students. Specific examples include the position of Coordinator of Academic Affairs at the Ackland Art Museum at the

University of Chapel Hill, the Frances Lehman Loeb Art Center at Vassar College, and the Jordon Schnitzer Museum of Art at the University of Oregon, as well as the two positions of Curator of Academic Programming and Associate Curator of Academic Programming at the Hood Museum of Dartmouth College, which help in facilitating the use of the museum as a teaching resource and promoting the study of the objects in its collection ("Meet the People," n.d.).

The staff hired for this specific position act "not only in the traditional role of object- and content-experts, but as *bridge people* who could help translate ideas and approaches across disciplines and across academic and non-academic constituencies" (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 10). With the CUAM program one of the most significant factors in its success across several different campus museums was ensuring there was a museum staff member dedicated to coordinating the efforts in reaching out to and maintaining communication with faculty and students (Goethals & Fabing, 2007). It was found that the coordinators played a big part in initiating engagement with faculty members and without these dedicated liaisons in place "the staff usually fell into reactive mode, responding only to those faculty who approached the museum with a request" (p. 15). The responsibility of purposefully deciding which programs and courses offered at the university or college might be served best by the offerings of the museum also falls within the role of the coordinator, which also includes then using a targeted email approach to inform deans, department chairs, and other faculty about these available resources (Glesne, 2012b).

The individual in this position at the Iowa University Art Museum offered to design curriculum-structured gallery programs for various courses, resulting in a high level of interest on behalf of different professors and subsequent participation of their classes in the program.

Establishing long-term relationships with particular departments or faculty that found the program valuable is an effective way to retain these groups in the future and also develop core gallery sessions that can be utilized year after year. The focus on making this position an essential part of the campus museum was found to be one of the most critical parts of the success that the participating CUAM Program museums saw, as noted by Glesne (2012b) in her statement that "the most important aspect of the Mellon funding, however, the aspect that is likely to become the "model" for other museums, is the creation of an academic curator position" (p. 26).

A case study at the Rhode Island School of Design Museum (RISD) examined the creation of a Faculty Fellow Program, an alternative to implementing a new academic coordinator position but having similar intents and outcomes. The program was designed to answer a question deemed important for curators of academic museums to ask: "How could a faculty member examining the educational possibilities of the museum from inside the collections serve to invent new strategies, programs and pedagogy, integrating museum resources with curricular activity?" (Raftery, 2008, p. 2). A professor at RISD, Andrew Raftery, introduced the program initiative in 2005 at the RISD Museum with the main idea centered around having a faculty member work one day per week during 34 weeks of the school year, assisting the curators with teaching and helping with other activities within the museum as needed. The requested compensation on behalf of the faculty was one course release for the academic year.

Raftery himself was the first Faculty Fellow appointed in the Department of Prints, Drawings and Photographs, being trained by museum staff in the various duties of the department. He noted the print room in particular as being a valuable resource for many students,

as it has walk-in hours that "allows students to do self-directed research from objects and study works of art suggested by their teachers" (Raferty, 2008, p. 3). He also noticed the tendency for student workers at the museum to recruit their classmates and friends to come in for the print room walk-in hours, thus spurring continuous interest and new visitors, some of whom then become regular visitors. During the afternoons Raftery spent much of his time preparing and presenting works for a class taught by one of his faculty colleagues, which he claims was the most important work he did as a Faculty Fellow. His studio class students would share their thoughts with him on what *aesthetic attitudes* their other professors were conveying to them, which helped him come up with suggestions for objects that those faculty members may be unfamiliar with and interested in using in their class visit to the museum, as he states he could "take these liberties with my studio colleagues in a way that would be difficult for the curators" (p. 3).

Bradley (2009) also recognizes this as a prominent case in successfully creating additional roles with the sole purpose of having a higher level of organized communication and engagement with faculty, noting the role Raftery and those taking his place thereafter experience as *loaner* staff members who function as a "hinge between two complementary but administratively separate units of the same institution" (p. 3). The Faculty Fellowship Program at the RISD Museum has been recreated and expanded at other institutions of higher education, representing an applicable blueprint for partnership between the campus museum and faculty, which also inadvertently increases engagement with students as well (Raftery, 2008).

Implementing a position such as an Academic Coordinator or Faculty Fellow that is dedicated to fostering and maintaining effective relationships with faculty and students on campus and, as a result, fueling positive connections between the academic museum and the

curricula being taught within its parent institution has "ushered in a new era of cooperation between the college and the museum" (Bradley, 2009, p. 4). It has been identified in the research with the CUAM Program participant museums that without this dedicated liaison, it is easy for staff to fall into a *reactive mode*, which hinders bridging between the two separate institutional units. The added position as one of the most crucial factors in expanding the relevancy of an academic art museum across the campus of its parent institution, may increase the likelihood of the additional expense being paid wholly or partially by grant funds or an allotted amount from the institution. As administrations of these higher education institutions are increasingly realizing that the campus museum as a *specially designed classroom*, which would benefit from the implementation of an academic liaison position responsible for creating valuable collaborations, "demonstrates a campus museum's commitment to curricular connections" (p. 6).

Diversification of Outreach Methods and Programming

Reaching out to an expanded array of campus constituents via innovative communication methods, whilst also hosting events and offering programming that draw upon the interests of students and faculty from various disciplines, can be seen as key factors in making the academic museum a more valuable and widely used resource. Social engagement is being sought after particularly by students, and in response, many other campus museums have shown that they have the ability to create new types of opportunities for student engagement, thus "recasting the campus art museum as venues not just for exhibits and curricular or co-curricular education but for extracurricular social gatherings and enjoyment – in other words, as entertaining and fun" (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 10).

In her report sponsored by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation that consists of interviews and observations at several campus museums identified as being exemplary, Glesne (2012c)

discusses the repeated challenge that many museum staff and student participants from the various campuses highlighted in getting faculty and students in non-art disciplines to visit the museums. To address the issue, methods to expand engagement and interest were implemented and saw successful results. To continue bringing in new audience groups, "museum staff, student groups, and community associations all work to create and host social events to entice others 'in the door,' so that they may connect in some way with art" (p. 104). One such event at the Museum of Art and Archaeology at the University of Missouri called *Art in Bloom* is held annually and involves local florists and gardeners creating flower arrangements to be on display at the museum that are inspired by and paired with a work of art within the museum. A wide variety of campus visitors have flocked to the museum for this event, which includes receiving a ballot upon entrance and voting on favorites in different categories that "ingeniously guide viewers to think about the color, texture, and movement of the floral arrangements and the works of art" (p. 104).

Other examples of efforts to increase engagement include the creation of special collaborative programming for *Football Saturdays* at the Snite Museum of Art at the University of Notre Dame and the *Sketching at the Smart* program developed the David and Alfred Smart Museum at the University of Chicago, which occurs on a regular basis and involves a partnership with the studio and visual art departments to provide various sketching activities for visitors. The Smart Museum also offers *Study at the Smart*, often taking place during finals, wherein the museum opens during the evening for students to use the space for studying and also offers free refreshments. This type of programming has been successfully replicated at other campus museums due to its simplicity and cost-effectiveness, as well as its appeal as a new place to study

or be social and its success in acquainting students with the museum who were previously unfamiliar with or interested in it, thus increasing their chances of returning (Glesne, 2012c).

Another unique initiative is the Art Rental Program at the Oberlin College Allen Memorial Art Museum, which began in 1940 and has continued every year since, growing in popularity over the years (Dickson, 2011). The program allows students to rent two original pieces of art each semester for five dollars per piece and has become to a large extent a social event with students lining up in the museum courtyard and many camping overnight in order to get the most desired pieces. Live music, games, and food all play a part in the event as well. The program has attracted those in arts-related majors and non-art majors alike and has even been described by students as a rite of passage for many. The significance of the program since its founding has been that by bringing a work of their choosing home to live with them temporarily, "students can not only develop their own taste in art, but be inspired on a daily basis by great, often provocative, works" (para. 3). Of course there must be strict regulations in place in order for such a program to run smoothly, and Oberlin has proven this to be attainable, as no piece has been lost or stolen in the 77 years since its origination ("Discover Oberlin," n.d.). The college has pioneered a strong framework for an inventive program proven to be successful that other campus museums may adapt for their own implementation, even if slight changes must be made, such as renting out framed copies of some works instead of originals.

Research on the College and University Art Museum (CUAM) Program found that at many participant schools, faculty from a wide array of disciplines "participated in generating programs and benefited from discourse with colleagues outside home departments" (Goethals & Fabing, 2007, p. 25), thus emphasizing the importance of involving faculty and students in decisions concerning program offerings as well as encouraging the formation of planning

committees as an effective way of doing so. Several of the museums even changed the composition of their program planning committees to include faculty representation and also create student liaison groups. It was also found that faculty engagement through special programming often leads to increased student engagement as well. An exhibition program titled *Label Talk* at the Williams College Museum of Art is a program highlighted in the CUAM Program report that was implemented as a way to engage faculty from non-art fields by asking them to compose art labels written from their different disciplinary perspectives, which were then mounted next to the corresponding artworks in the museum. Over the course of a few years over 40% of the campus faculty participated in the program, which proved to be an "effective way of drawing faculty members into the museum and beginning their 'conversation' with works of art" (p. 27), subsequently inspiring many to bring their students to the museum as a means of generating amongst them the same interest and curiosity they experienced. Programming that includes this type of engagement has shown to draw in faculty and students who may not otherwise visit the art museum(s) on their campus and motivate them to keep coming back by providing "insights into how to consider tangible objects through various disciplinary lenses" (Goethals & Fabing, 2007, p. 27).

Discussion

As academic art museums in the U.S. work to provide an effective and engaging platform from which interdisciplinary connections can be made through the artworks, they continue to face the challenges of both "adapting to and influencing a new and still-shifting cultural landscape" (Shapiro, et al., p. 2). King (2001) suggests that academic museums had previously been defined differently from other museums in regards to being able to take bigger risks with exhibitions and present "unpopular ideas or more esoteric points of view" (p. 23) due to the fact

that they were part of an academy that supported and encouraged open dialogue of all ideas. Freedom in the academics made up the backbone of universities and their museums, but that has changed in the last decade and continues to evolve in current times, as academic museums have now been thrown into the marketplace with the other non-academic institutions, forcing them to compete for funding. King goes on to state that academic museums are becoming "less university museums and more museums at universities (p. 23)," which, although not entirely undesirable, does provide challenges as it is determined what makes art museums at universities different from other non-academic museums in the coming decades.

As such, campus museums are finding themselves in an increasingly competitive funding pool and must therefore figure out how to distinguish themselves as valued, multidisciplinary resources. When the competition involves largely STEM- and athletics-related initiatives, it remains a challenge for the museums to effectively show both their parent institutions and outside donors the academic relevancy they have as an arts-based resource for a variety of students and faculty. Without conveying this, the worthiness of the funding cause is unclear and the support likely to be allotted to the more longstanding, trusted resources such as those pertaining to sports, science, and technology.

However, it has been noted by Goethals and Fabing (2007) in their research that when effective strategies are implemented to engage across disciplines, college and university administrations are more likely to see their campus art museums as resources rather than resource drains. The authors outline in their CUAM Program report their finding regarding how dedicating resources to various course curricula made the involved museums *players* on their campuses that provide useful, relevant learning resources, thus placing them on par with other campus entities (p. 7). Over time, the success of the participant museums, coupled with the

increasing acknowledgement that the priorities and values of the parent institutions and their campus art museums were the same, built trust and respect for the museums on behalf of the school administrations. The success of the museums also leveraged more resources for them, showing that the administrations and boards of universities and colleges must be confident in the value and relevancy of their campus art museums to a diverse range of students and faculty belonging to a variety of both art- and non-art fields. In regards to the transition to a greater academic focus made by the CUAM Program participant museums, the report states that:

> To adjust their operations and programs to accommodate the new academic activity, campus museums had to think deeply about their missions…this reexamination led to the decision that commitment to the academic program should take precedence. Their commitment to putting the academic audience at the center of their endeavor was one of the profound consequences of the CUAM Program (Goethals & Fabing, 2007, p. 12).

This effort proved to be of fundamental importance in helping the museums to reexamine their mission and priorities, resulting in a consensus that "contributing actively to the core academic agenda of their colleges and universities should be the primary focus" (p. 29).

Due to the necessary shifting of funds to allocate more to staff, space, and/or programming in the effort to prioritize being an educational resource, other expenditure areas may need to be reduced for some time, but it has been seen that as administrators come to acknowledge the academic learning value of their campus museums they become more "forthcoming with additional support or with permission to raise outside funds" (p. 29) as a means to strengthen the academic initiatives of the museums. Demonstrated as a key result of the CUAM Program, donors who are able to see and understand the commitment of academic art museums providing opportunities for interdisciplinary learning become increasingly motivated to help fund this effort, thus revealing how programs such as CUAM can be beneficial to the financial well-being and even improve it.

However, as not all institutions are currently in the position to receive the highly generous external funding allotted from the CUAM Mellon grants, the program has paved the way for similar programs to be established by setting a precedent showing other donors the widespread academic benefits of funding such an effort (Glesne, 2012b). The success of the CUAM participant museums in raising almost six million dollars in matching funds upon solidifying an academic focus in alignment with the mission and values of their parent institutions "demonstrates that museum donors are willing to support academic endeavors" (Goethals & Fabing, 2007, p. 20). Even without extra grant money, many academic art museums are figuring out effective ways to engage academically that are also cost friendly, such as the Museum of Art and Archaeology at the University of Missouri that was able to create a half-time academic coordinator position without having to drastically change other cost allocations, the positive outcomes of which offset any initial financial loss (Glesne, 2012b). The economic position of these museums can also improve within the larger parent institutions in which they reside when their value as unique academic resources is heightened, thus likening the opportunity for increased institutional support. Bradley (2009) summarizes this sentiment in her claim that "aligning museum programs with the teaching and research agendas of the college/university may yield increased internal funding in today's climate" (p. 6).

Zeller (1985) postulates in her work outlining the various roles the campus art museum plays that the most significant challenges and opportunities for these museums are in "devising effective programs to help more undergraduates learn how to understand and enjoy art" (p. 94). Creating programming that is feasible in regards to funding and also engages those belonging to a variety of disciplines, rather than solely those pertaining to the arts, is an ongoing obstacle that differs campus to campus. The challenge also lies in engaging students on their own terms

because they "want more autonomy and control over their cultural experiences," thus seeking opportunities for "engaged, fluid participation, 'insider' access to the process as well as the 'products' of a culture, an authentic voice for themselves in the experience, and modes of interaction that are not mediated by the traditional, hierarchical structures of authority" (Shapiro, et al., p. 9). As many student populations become increasingly diverse, campus art museums have noted persistent difficulty in getting students of various backgrounds and interests interested in visiting, an issue that is exacerbated by the predicament of time and scheduling constraints, as demands of curricular and extracurricular activities are also increasing and in competition with each other. Bradley (2009) explains this tension that results from the working schedules and calendars of the schools and the campus museums, which are often not in sync, due largely to exhibitions requiring a two to three-year planning curve while academic calendars for students and faculty are spread out in ten to fifteen term increments. This makes it difficult to schedule class visits and plan for curriculum-based programming, thus leaving many faculty to forego the idea of using the campus museum as a learning resource for their classes altogether.

Developing and maintaining strong partnerships between the academic side of the parent institution and the campus museum are therefore key, meaning active communication between museum staff and school faculty is essential (Bradley, 2009). A recommendation to assist in achieving this based on its success at multiple campuses is involving museum staff in faculty orientations at the college or university by organizing and including in the program workshops on how the museum can be used academically, along with a visit to the museum if possible (Glesne, 2012b). The often missing gap that remains between the academic system of a college or university and its campus art museum is recognized in the CUAM Program report as existing inequities between museum curators and faculty members, stating that:

> Faculty and curators continue largely to exist in parallel, intersecting from time to time, but remaining in most cases far from comparable in status or opportunity. This remains a dilemma which should be addressed over the coming years if campus museums are to reach their full potential as partners in the academic agenda (Goethals and Fabing, 2007, p. 18).

Although some institutions are adapting various methods mentioned in this report to narrow this gap and reduce the siloed nature of the academic art museum, many have reason to follow suit now that effective templates of been created and tested in a variety of campus contexts. The value of the campus museum as a useful educational resource is realized when positive connections are forged, as illustrated by Glesne (2012b) in her claim that when encouraged by museum staff who have made involvement with the academics a core part of their mission, "faculty and students across the disciplines are learning how the academic art museum can expand horizons, opening up a breadth of ideas, creativity, and possibilities" (p. 33).

Conclusions and Recommendations

Academic art museums in the U.S. have made significant strides in recent years in making themselves increasingly relevant to a broader range of students and faculty at their parent institutions, thus providing much to be commended for, especially in the face of increasing competition between available academic resources and opportunities. However, there are plenty of opportunities for further research that can be pursued, most critically on the issue of obtaining more funding for academic art museums. This extended research, in conjunction with increased adaption by more institutions of some of the strategies outlined in this report, can be inferred as two critical factors needed for these museums to remain valuable educational resources in the eyes of their funders, both internal and external. In continuing to implement effective measures of engagement across disciplines, academic art museums can more confidently secure their place

as a valued scholarly tool, as aptly observed and described by university administrator Melanie Kelly (2001):

> They are already striving to find imaginative new visions and more distinctive profiling for their museums using all available resources. By making their own significant steps towards securing a more positive future, they hope to show their universities, relevant external bodies and, perhaps more importantly, their colleagues working in other university museums what can be achieved. Having demonstrated their potential and articulated their responses to the changing environment in which they work, they are better placed to petition for additional support (p. 15).

A potential asset that could be more heavily utilized is the Task Force for the Protection of University Collections, which was established in 2009 by the Association of Academic Museums and Galleries as a means to create and enforce standards in museum practices at academic museums, largely pertaining to guidelines around deaccessioning. The task force is made up of representatives of museum associations, foundations, and university faculty, and is responsible for monitoring for potential threats to university collections. Perhaps initiating a more active role in promoting the value of academic art museums could be a beneficial objective for the task force, as this could help minimize the view of the museums as "disposable and coveted assets by parent organizations desperate to shore up faltering endowment funds or to fill budget gaps caused by reduced funding from states" ("Task Force," para. 2). Having legal influence as well as members with highly experienced backgrounds could allow the task force to deliver powerful stimulus in protecting and supporting academic museums across the country.

Bradley (2009) identifies important questions to be addressed in the future, such as "How should campus museums balance their responsibilities to conserve, protect, and research the collection with a mandate to offer up the collection on demand to classes across the college?" and "How far down the road should college and university museums go toward becoming resource centers, operating on a service model more similar to the library than the current

museum model?" (p. 15). These questions point to the balance that academic art museums are trying to find between upholding traditional museum standards in conservation and curation on one hand, and being a hands-on learning tool adaptable for various use on the other.

The potential academic art museums in the U.S. hold is vast and laden with opportunities for growth, which are rooted in the strong multidisciplinary base the museums featured in this report have built using key principles of the teaching museum ideology. This notion is made clear by the consensus amongst a diverse group of museum professionals detailed in the Cultural Policy Center report that "Campus museums have unique potential – some of it already being tapped, some of it probably still latent – to emerge as leaders and change agents in the new era" (Shapiro, et al., 2012, p. 15). Only time will tell if academic art museums will be able to thrive within an academic climate that is continually in flux, with an emerging emphasis on STEM fields and equally rising competition for funding. However, as they become increasingly valued as effective sites for fostering learning, creativity, and curricular connections amongst students, faculty, and researchers across disciplines, the prognosis for success in strengthening their relevancy looks bright.

References

About the Tang Museum. (n.d.) Retrieved from https://tang.skidmore.edu/about

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544-559.

Bradley, L. (2009, August 12). Curricular connections: The college/university art museum as site for teaching and learning. *College Art Association*. Retrieved from http://www.caareviews.org/reviews/1309#.WFmsO1UrKUk

Cocurate. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://wcma.williams.edu/collaborate/cocurate/

Cohen, P. (2016, February 21). A rising call to promote STEM education and cut liberal arts funding. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/22/business/a-rising-call-to-promote-stem-education-and-cut-liberal-arts-funding.html?_r=0

Coleman, L.V. (1942). College and university art museums: A message for college and university presidents. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Museums.

Cotter, H. (2009, February 19). Why university museums matter. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/20/arts/design/20yale.html

Dickson, EJ. (2011, September 22). Students Continue Campus Tradition with Annual Art Rental Program. Retrieved from http://new.oberlin.edu/home/news-media/detail.dot?id=3484544

Discover Oberlin. (n.d.). Art Rental Program. Retrieved from http://www.oberlin.edu/news-info/discover/artRental.html

Douglass, L. (2012, October 12). What's better than college art history 101? A campus museum. *Forbes*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/lynndouglass/2012/10/22/whats-better-than-college-art-history-101-a-campus-museum/#4626c5cb2a76

Glesne, C. (2012a). Museum art in everyday life. *LEARNing Landscapes*, 5(2), 99-116.

Glesne, C. (2012b). *The campus art museum: A qualitative study – II. Art across the curriculum.* A report prepared for the Samuel H. Kress Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.kressfoundation.org/uploadedFiles/Sponsored_Research/Research/Glesne_02_ArtAcrossCurriculum.pdf

Glesne, C. (2012c). *The campus art museum: A qualitative study – IV. Challenges and conditions of success for campus art museum.* A report prepared for the Samuel H. Kress Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.kressfoundation.org/uploadedFiles/Sponsored_Research/Research/Glesne_Complete.pdf

Goethals, M., & Fabing, S. (2007). *College and university art museum program*. A summary report prepared for the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Retrieved from http://mac.mellon.org/CUAM/cuam_report.pdf.

Hood Museum of Art: An extraordinary teaching collection (2016, July 18). Retrieved from http://hoodmuseum.dartmouth.edu/learn/dartmouth-faculty

Hood Museum of Art: Learn at the Hood (2016, October 26). Retrieved from http://hoodmuseum.dartmouth.edu/learn/learn-hood

Hood Museum of Art: Meet the people in the department. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://hoodmuseum.dartmouth.edu/explore/museum/staff

Jaschik, S. (2009, January 29). Museums and academic values. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/01/29/penn

Kelly, M. (2001). Introduction. In Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (Ed.), *Managing university museums: Education and skills* (pp. 7-15). Paris: OECD Publishing.

Kim, H. (2007). Crossing cultures: Redefining a university museum. *Anthropology and Aesthetics*, 1(52), 44-50.

King, L. (2001). University museums in the 21st century. In Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (Ed.), *Managing university museums: Education and skills* (pp. 19-28). Paris: OECD Publishing.

Lewin, T. (2013, October 30). As interest fades in the humanities, colleges worry. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/31/education/as-interest-fades-in-the-humanities-colleges-worry.html

Mandelbaum, D. (1953). University museums. *American Anthropologist*, 55(5), 755-759.

Matthias, D. (1987). Education and the university museum. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 21(3), 83-96.

Raftery, A. (2008, April). *Teaching from a museum collection*. Paper presented at the RISD Symposium on Teaching and Learning, Providence, RI. Retrieved from https://risdcollegiateteaching.files.wordpress.com/2008/06/tfamc_raftery.pdf

Rose Object Classroom. (n.d). Retrieved from https://wcma.williams.edu/rose-object-classroom/

Shapiro, T., Linett, P., Farrell, B., & Anderson, W. (2012). *Campus art museums in the 21st century: A conversation.* Cultural Policy Center at the University of Chicago. Retrieved from http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/sites/culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/files/campusartmuseumsreport_0.pdf

Sheets. H. (2017, January 5). Why US universities are investing in their art museums. *The Art Newspaper*. Retrieved from http://theartnewspaper.com/news/museums/why-us-universities-are-investing-in-their-art-museums/

Stake, R. (2003). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), Strategies of qualitative inquiry (2nd Ed.) (pp. 134-164). SAGE Publications.

Task force for the protection of university collections. (2016). Association of Academic Museums and Galleries (AAMG). Retrieved from https://www.aamg-us.org/wp/professional-resources/task-force/

Thomas, N. (2016, July 14). Revitalised university museums still face big challenges. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/comment/revitalised-university-museums-still-face-big-challenges

Weber, J. (2012, November 8). The interdisciplinary campus museum. *Center for the Future of Museums*. Retrieved from http://futureofmuseums.blogspot.com/2012/11/the-interdisciplinary-campus-museum.html

Zeller, T. (1985). The role of the campus art museum. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 28(2), 87-95